



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,606	10/29/2003	Gregory Wolff	015358-005210US	9621
20350 7590 04/27/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
MEUCCI, MICHAEL D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,606

Applicant(s)

WOLFF, GREGORY

Examiner

MICHAEL D. MEUCCI

Art Unit

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2003 and 18 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: 20090127
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed 29 January 2009.
2. Claims 12-24 are pending.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

a. The applicant filed a preliminary amendment on 29 October 2003 which added a paragraph to page 1 of the specification which incorrectly declares that the instant application is a divisional application of U.S. patent application 09/314,614 (now U.S. 6,668,271). The instant application is a CONTINUATION of U.S. patent application 09/314,614 (now U.S. 6,668,271) and the specification should be amended accordingly should the applicant desire to obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application. Attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 120 and 37 CFR 1.78. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 14, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The limitations "coupling the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an agency device," and "coupling the plurality of agency base units are couple to an HTTP server," do not make grammatical sense. For the purpose of applying art, the examiner presumes the applicant means "the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an agency device" and "the plurality of agency base units are couple to an HTTP server" respectively. Correction of the language is required.

b. Claim 22 recites the limitations "an agency" and "a message passing interface" in line 2. Because both of these terms are declared in claim 21, it is unclear to the examiner whether the same agency and message passing interface are desired to be claimed in claim 22, or another agency and message passing interface. Clarification is required. Applicant's assistance is requested in correcting any additional antecedent basis issues they may come across in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12-14, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron et al. (U.S. 6,539,027 B1) in view of Sudhakaran et al. (U.S. 6,141,712) hereinafter referred to as Sudhakaran and Luther et al. (U.S. 5,715,370) hereinafter referred to as Luther.

a. Regarding claim 12, Cambron teaches: configuring a plurality of agency base units such that each agency base unit is addressable at an address on the network (lines 2-5 of column 11); storing, on an agent card of a plurality of agent cards, at least one response functionality for implementing one or more response functions (lines 32-40 of column 9); storing, on the agent card, a state for the at least one response functionality that is provided to a user of the network at an address dependent on the address of the agency base unit into which the agent card is mounted (lines 54-57 of column 7);

Cambron does not explicitly teach: mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit ; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; after instantiating the at least one response functionality off the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card; receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to

the request; and updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality.

Regarding: mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit ; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card, Sudhakaran discloses: "As with the manual I/O card, the auto-configurable card 440 is installed using a computer viewer object 402 which provides to a user a graphical view of the hardware components in the computer system. The computer viewer object 402 instantiates a control panel object 412 which provides a user with a way to change the system configuration. The control panel object 412, in turn, instantiates a plug and play I/O card object 436 as indicated by arrow 418. The plug and play I/O card object 436 retrieves default resource assignments directly from the card 440 as indicated by arrow 434," (lines 55-64 of column 14 and Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to mount the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiate the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, provide an agent identifier from the agent card

to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card. "The plug and play I/O card object 436 registers the resource requirements, such as possible assignments, default assignment and constraints in assignments for the I/O functions on the card with the resolver object 420 as indicated by arrow 430. The plug and play I/O card object 436 then asks the resolver object 420 to produce a resource assignment for each I/O function on the card," (line 65 of column 14 through line 4 of column 15 in Sudhakaran). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to mount the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiate the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, provide an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card in the system as taught by Cambron.

Regarding: receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality, "Luther discloses: "A personal computer user stores the calendar format file in memory, such as on the

network file server 21 or local hard disk 31, and upon request can retrieve the information for a desired date and time," (line 67 of column 6 through line 4 of column 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; execute the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and update the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality. "Referring to FIG. 6, there is illustrated calendar format file 60. Calendar format file 60 consists of hierarchical fields which are interrelated by date, time and appointment. The type of calendar format file may differ depending on the type of software utilized," (lines 59-63 of column 6 in Luther). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to receive, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; execute the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and update the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality in the system as taught by Cambron and Sudhakaran.

b. Regarding claim 13, Cambron does not explicitly teach: wherein the request is issued to the agency base unit over the network. However, Luther discloses:

"A personal computer user stores the calendar format file in memory, such as on the network file server 21 or local hard disk 31, and upon request can retrieve the information for a desired date and time," (line 67 of column 6 through line 4 of column 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the request issued to the agency base unit over the network. The requesting of the service to the agency base unit across a network allows the requesting system access to networked services not locally available to the requesting system. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the request issued to the agency base unit over the network.

c. Regarding claim 14, Cambron teaches: coupling the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an agency device (lines 21-31 of column 7).

d. Regarding claim 21, Cambron teaches: adapting the agent card to perform on-card processing for processing messages received from an agency through a message passing interface (lines 21-31 of column 7).

e. Regarding claim 22, Cambron teaches: processing, on the agent card, messages received from an agency through a message passing interface (lines 21-31 of column 7).

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Land et al. (U.S. 6,008,805) hereinafter referred to as Land.

a. Regarding claim 15, Cambron does not explicitly teach: coupling the plurality of agency base units are coupled to an HTTP server. However, Land discloses: "Initially, the combined HTTP server/SNMP manager receives from the HTTP client a request to display the table entry for Frame-Relay-Local-Port-Configure-Entry with indexes 2, 1. The MIB name for the requested entry is frLportCnfEntry," (line 66 of column 15 through line 3 of column 16). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the plurality of agency base units coupled to an HTTP server. "In response to the request, the combined HTTP server /SNMP manager finds and reads the line from the file "<filename>info.dat" that indicates the OID for the indicated table item," (lines 3-6 of column 16 in Land). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the plurality of agency base units coupled to an HTTP server in the system as taught by Cambron.

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Ransom et al. (U.S. 6,990,395 B2) hereinafter referred to as Ransom.

a. Regarding claim 16, Cambron does not explicitly teach: storing the state as an XML file in a file system on the agent card. However, Ransom discloses: "In one embodiment, the IED is capable of saving the complete operational state of the device prior to commencing processing of the XML document, or a processable segment thereof," (lines 12-15 of column 34). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the state as an XML file in a file system on the agent card. This allows "restoring that state should an error occur," (lines 15-16 of column 34 in Ransom). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to store the state as an XML file in a file system on the agent card.

10. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Oatman et al. (U.S. 5,778,157) hereinafter referred to as Oatman.

a. Regarding claims 17 and 18, Cambron does not explicitly teach: storing transformations of documents, as described by a tagset, as a tagset file in a file system on the agent card; and adapting the agent card with program instructions for applying transforms specified in a tagset to a document. However, Oatman discloses: "Within the knowledge base 160, a value 470 can be associated with one or more value-level modifier sets 440. Each modifier set 440 includes zero or more TagSet modifiers 2225B which tie the modifier set to assertion TagSets 2270 within the URT structures," (lines 43-47 of column 28). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store transformations of documents, as described by a tagset, as a tagset file in a file system on the agent card; and adapt the agent card with program instructions for applying transforms specified in a tagset to a document. These TagSets 2270 help identify the logical context (e.g., function, ThenClause, ElseClause) for the value's 470 assertion," (lines 47-49 of column 28 in Oatman). It is

for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to store transformations of documents, as described by a tagset, as a tagset file in a file system on the agent card; and adapt the agent card with program instructions for applying transforms specified in a tagset to a document in the system as taught by Cambron.

b. Regarding claims 19 and 20, Cambron teaches: storing state and data for the agent card in a file structure or a static file structure (lines 30-33 of column 13). Cambron does not explicitly teach: storing tagsets in a file structure or static file structure. However, Oatman discloses: "Within the knowledge base 160, an attribute 320 can contain an attribute-level modifier set 410. The modifier set 410 includes zero or more TagSet modifiers 2225A (special types of modifier 46) which tie the modifier set to request TagSets 2260 within the URT structures. These TagSets 2260 help identify logic statements 340 that are dependent upon the attribute 320. An attribute's 320 TagSet modifiers 2225A are written when the Decision process 150 reviews the attribute's values 470," (lines 34-42 of column 28). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store tagsets in a file structure or static file structure. "Within the knowledge base 160, a value 470 can be associated with one or more value-level modifier sets 440. Each modifier set 440 includes zero or more TagSet modifiers 2225B which tie the modifier set to assertion TagSets 2270 within the URT structures. These TagSets 2270 help identify the logical context (e.g., function, ThenClause, ElseClause) for the value's 470 assertion. A value's 470 TagSet modifiers 2225B are written when logic statements 340 write values to an

attribute 320," (lines 42-51 of column 28 in Oatman). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to store tagsets in a file structure or static file structure in the system as taught by Cambron.

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron, Sudhakaran, and Luther as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Takatsuki et al. (U.S. 2003/0075599 A1) hereinafter referred to as Takatsuki.

a. Regarding claim 23, Cambron does not explicitly teach: monitoring for an ejection request indicating a desire to eject the agent card; and in response to receipt of an ejection request, writing a state of the agent card to the agent card prior to the agent card being removed from the agency base unit. However, Takatsuki discloses: "When the user tries to eject the IC card 10 from the card reader/writer 9 to interrupt the work, the CPU 1 saves all of information in the state at this time of interruption to the server by completion of the ejection of the IC card 10 and finishes the process," (paragraph [0030] on page 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to monitor for an ejection request indicating a desire to eject the agent card; and in response to receipt of an ejection request, writing a state of the agent card to the agent card prior to the agent card being removed from the agency base unit. "The CPU 1 automatically sets the work environment at the time point when the user interrupted the previous work on the basis of the downloaded information and allows the display 2 to display the state at the time of the previous work interruption,"

(paragraph [0030] on page 2 of Takatsuki). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to monitor for an ejection request indicating a desire to eject the agent card; and in response to receipt of an ejection request, writing a state of the agent card to the agent card prior to the agent card being removed from the agency base unit in the system as taught by Cambron.

12. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambron in view of Sudhakaran, Luther, and Land

a. Regarding claim 24, Cambron teaches: configuring a plurality of agency base units such that each agency base unit is addressable at an address on the network (lines 2-5 of column 11); storing, on an agent card of a plurality of agent cards, at least one response functionality for implementing one or more response functions (lines 32-40 of column 9); storing, on the agent card, a state for the at least one response functionality that is provided to a user of the network at an address dependent on the address of the agency base unit into which the agent card is mounted (lines 54-57 of column 7);

Cambron does not explicitly teach: coupling each of the plurality of agency base units to an HTTP server; mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit ; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; after instantiating the at

least one response functionality of the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card; receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality.

Regarding: coupling each of the plurality of agency base units to an HTTP server, Land discloses: "Initially, the combined HTTP server/SNMP manager receives from the HTTP client a request to display the table entry for Frame-Relay-Local-Port-Configure-Entry with indexes 2, 1. The MIB name for the requested entry is frLportCnfEntry," (line 66 of column 15 through line 3 of column 16). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the plurality of agency base units coupled to an HTTP server. "In response to the request, the combined HTTP server /SNMP manager finds and reads the line from the file "<filename>info.dat" that indicates the OID for the indicated table item," (lines 3-6 of column 16 in Land). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the plurality of agency base units coupled to an HTTP server in the system as taught by Cambron.

Regarding: mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit; in response to mounting the agent

Card into the base unit, instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card, Sudhakaran discloses: "As with the manual I/O card, the auto-configurable card 440 is installed using a computer viewer object 402 which provides to a user a graphical view of the hardware components in the computer system. The computer viewer object 402 instantiates a control panel object 412 which provides a user with a way to change the system configuration. The control panel object 412, in turn, instantiates a plug and play I/O card object 436 as indicated by arrow 418. The plug and play I/O card object 436 retrieves default resource assignments directly from the card 440 as indicated by arrow 434," (lines 55-64 of column 14 and Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to mount the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiate the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, provide an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card. "The plug and play I/O card object 436 registers the resource requirements, such as possible assignments, default assignment and constraints in assignments for the I/O functions on the card with the resolver object 420 as indicated

by arrow 430. The plug and play I/O card object 436 then asks the resolver object 420 to produce a resource assignment for each I/O function on the card," (line 65 of column 14 through line 4 of column 15 in Sudhakaran). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to mount the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit; in response to mounting the agent Card into the base unit, instantiate the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card; and after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, provide an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card in the system as taught by Cambron.

Regarding: receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality, "Luther discloses: "A personal computer user stores the calendar format file in memory, such as on the network file server 21 or local hard disk 31, and upon request can retrieve the information for a desired date and time," (line 67 of column 6 through line 4 of column 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is

mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; execute the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and update the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality. "Referring to FIG. 6, there is illustrated calendar format file 60. Calendar format file 60 consists of hierarchical fields which are interrelated by date, time and appointment. The type of calendar format file may differ depending on the type of software utilized," (lines 59-63 of column 6 in Luther). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to receive, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality received over the network, the request including the agent identifier; execute the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and update the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality in the system as taught by Cambron and Sudhakaran.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 29 January 2009, with respect to the rejection of claims 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) with regard to Edwards have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection have been made in as described above.

All of the applicant's arguments are directed towards newly claimed subject matter and have been addressed in the rejections above.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442